

Appendix G: Transcript of Public Scoping Meeting - Maxwell, California, January 9, 2002

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/STATEMENT
NORTH-OF-THE-DELTA OFFSTREAM STORAGE
MAXWELL INN
81 OAK STREET MAXWELL, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 2002

6:00 P.M.

PROCEEDINGS

-oOo-

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: We're going to be starting now, and I hope that everybody has had an opportunity to sign in on the sheets back there, and if you haven't, please take the opportunity throughout this process, or at the end of the process, because that becomes our mailing list for getting your responses to this meeting, and also for the future mailings for any other meetings we have as the project goes on.

My name is Gwen Buchholz, and I'm your Facilitator tonight. My job is to basically keep us in an orderly fashion so that we can obtain comments and work through this.

This meeting tonight is for the North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage program. We're starting the environmental documentation process for this project right now, in which to prepare -- and is to notify you of our intent to prepare the Department of Water Resources and the Bureau of Reclamation, to prepare the Environmental Impact Report, and an Environmental Impact Statement.

The purpose of tonight's meeting is to obtain comments on the alternatives that we want -- that you all want us to look at in this process, and issues that need to be looked at in detail to do an appropriate evaluation of those alternatives in this process. What we're going to be doing tonight is that we will have some opening remarks, and then we'll be having a short presentation about the information that was put together, and we'll talk about that before we get there. And then -- and that will take a very little time -- and then the main reason that we're here tonight is to listen to you and to obtain comments from all of you so that we can put these in the record, and they can become part of our process, because we want to take direction as we get it from the stakeholders and the interested public as we go through this.

I'd like to introduce a few people at the beginning of this process. On the -- up here tonight, we have Van Tenney, from Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District; Art Bullock, from the Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority. We have Sean Sou, from Department of Water Resources; Donna Garcia, from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation; and B.G. Heiland, from the Department of Water Resources. We also have Steve Roberts, from Department of Water Resources; Naser Bateni, from Department of Water

Resources; and Scott Woodland, who you will see names on, to get all of the comments. He will be collecting the comments for the environmental documentation.

At this time, though, I'd like to have Assemblyman Dickerson give us a welcome, and to introduce our -- well, today.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKERSON: Thank you.

Good evening. I want to welcome all of you to this very important scoping meeting on Offstream Storage North-of-the-Delta.

California, with a population that's nearing 35 million, has had no significant infrastructure changes in its water system for nearly 40 years. At the urging of the Legislature, the Governor, and the Secretary of the Interior, the CALFED record of decision included integrated storage investigations to consider groundwater and surface water alternatives. The Department of Water Resources, in cooperation with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, has for several years been conducting preliminary investigations into the possibility of increasing our state groundwater and surface storage capacity to help solve water needs for agriculture, the Delta ecosystem, and the domestic water for our growing population.

Today, they are asking for your views on the issues, benefits, and the future impacts with or without offstream storage. This is information that we would hope they would consider as they proceed with the planning. Formal planning now begins, and your feedback tonight

will be key to those future decisions. I compliment all of you on showing your interest by being here tonight, and urge that the agencies repeat this local input process every step of the way. This should not be, and I know it will not be, the only scoping meeting that they hold, but they need to hold as many as possible to truly get good public input.

Let me introduce a few elected officials who are joining us here tonight. They show their interest and their concern over water, I think, by their presence here tonight.

Forrest Sprague. I think most of you know Forrest, he's currently a Supervisor in Glenn County.

Trish Clarke, Supervisor from Shasta County.

Bill Waite, Supervisor from Colusa County.

Bill Borrer, Supervisor from Tehama County.

Keith Hansell, Glenn County.

Pat Kight, the Mayor of Redding.

Kim Davis is here, representing Senator Johannessen. I know I saw you someplace, there's Kim back there.

Chuck Harris is a former Supervisor of Glenn County. Still here, still interested in this issue. Sheriff Shadinger, from Colusa County, is somewhere, someplace.

FROM THE AUDIENCE: He's hiding out.

(Laughter.)

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKERSON: Hiding out. I think I saw newly -- well, not all that newly -- elected Councilman from Williams, Peter J., over there in the corner.

And, oh, yes, I didn't have you -- how do I always miss you, Doug? I always do that.

Okay. With that, we'll get started with the program. And once again, I want to thank you all for being here. It's extremely important. As always, the turn-out in this room for a Sites Reservoir issue is impressive. It's because you folks care enough to be here, and I, for one, really appreciate that.

So we'll get the business started now. Thank you.

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Thank you, Assemblyman Dickerson.

We also have one other person participating in our welcome presentations, and David Guy, who represents the northern California interests, if you could --

MR. GUY: Thank you, Gwen. And, like Assemblyman Dickerson, I'd like to thank everybody for coming out here on this evening to participate in this process, this very important process. I want to, before we get started, thank Assemblyman Dickerson for his leadership on water and other issues for the Sacramento Valley, and the other elected officials that are participating in this process. We're very fortunate to have such good representation.

This is a once in a generation opportunity to be evaluating and considering a project like this. I don't think there's any question about it, these things don't come along very often. And this is a particularly unique opportunity, because we have a project here where we're going to have local partners and local participation in a project, and that is different than a lot of the projects around the country that have been done in the past. And this local partnership is going to be incumbent a lot upon your participation, and it's going to be really, I think, what will ultimately decide whether this kind of a project succeeds or fails will

be whether we are successful in empowering the local people to do what they can do best. And there's -- I just can't say enough how exciting, in my view, this local participation is. Obviously, we have several of the local partners here tonight. Hopefully they will be speaking later. Mentioned Van, with Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District, Art with Tehama-Colusa Canal, being the most immediate because, at least the proposal is to at least use their facilities, the Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority and the GCID Main Canal, in part, to wheel the water to a Sites Reservoir. And so they have a very important role in this process. There are other local partners throughout the valley, water suppliers, counties, and many others that are going to be critical to advancing this kind of a project.

As Assemblyman Dickerson mentioned, this is really the beginning. We were here about a year ago, as I recall, in kicking off the MOU that started the ball rolling for this process. There's going to be several more steps. It's a process by which you have to be patient. I know I'm not a very patient person, so I'm not real crazy about it, but that's the process in the world that we live in, and we need to be patient and we need to be diligent in making sure that we have participation like we have tonight every step of the way, as Assemblyman Dickerson mentioned.

Again, a once in a generation opportunity. I couldn't be more excited to be here tonight and see such

great participation from the Sacramento Valley. It's a real honor to be here. Thank you.

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Thank you, David.

Now we'd like to go into a presentation. And again, I want to remind you that the main reason that we're here today is to obtain your comments, but before we start that process, what we'd like to do is to give a very brief summary presentation that summarizes the information that was put in what's called the Notice of Intent and a Notice of Preparation. And those were published back in November, and they're federal and state documents that are put into the specific registers to allow the public to know that there is an intent to develop an environmental documentation. We have copies of those for anybody that needs them. If we've run out, which may have happened tonight, we will get them to you if you fill out on the comment cards that you would like a copy of those. What I would like to ask your indulgence for is that tonight, if we could just run through the brief presentation first, and hold the comments until afterwards so that we can make sure that we record those comments. And we're going to use the speaker cards, so as you're listening to the presentation, if you would like to make a comment, we need you to fill out the blue speaker cards, and we'll be passing those out. We'll walk through the aisles, and we'll also be collecting those. I think some of them are white, too. And so, but during the presentation, if you could just hold those comments. If you want to just write them down and turn them in later, not make a presentation, that's fine, too.

So, with that, I'd like to have Sean Sou make the presentation.

MR. SOU: Thank you, Gwen, and good evening, everyone. Can everyone hear in the back?

Okay. In order to introduce the North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage program I'm going to describe the North-of-the-Delta or the Sacramento River region and the Sacramento River -- is that better?

(Inaudible asides.)

MR. SOU: Okay. Is that better? Can everyone hear in the back? Okay. Well, I'll try to speak a little louder. In order to introduce the North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage program, I'm going to describe the North-of-the-Delta region or the Sacramento River region and the Sacramento River.

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Maybe we could try this one.

(Inaudible asides.)

MR. SOU: Okay. Is this better? Okay, speaking maybe without a speaker, real loud.

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: I think we've actually --yeah, some people have asked to slow down a little bit, too, since we --

MR. SOU: Okay. All right. In order to introduce North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage program, I'm going to describe the North-of-the-Delta, or the Sacramento River region, the Sacramento River, the CALFED program, the proposed North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage program, and the flexibility provided by such an Offstream Storage program, the North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage Planning Partnership, the environmental documentation, and opportunities for public participation.

The water resources of the Sacramento River region support 2.5 million people and associated industries, over two million acres of farmland, 200,000 acres of marsh and agricultural farmland for waterfowl that's supporting over 60 percent of the total duck and goose population in the Pacific flyway. And, of course, flows for riverine habitat. These regional water needs are projected to increase in the future.

This is a map showing the Sacramento River region. Basically it covers an area from the north, from the Oregon border, to the south in Collinsville, which is about 300 miles, roughly. At the same time, the Sacramento River and its tributaries make up the largest and most important riverine ecosystem in California. These factors combined have brought us a number of challenges facing the region. Those challenges include that water users are subjected to shortages in both average and drought years. A number of species depending on the riverine ecosystem are listed as endangered or threatened species.

The Sacramento River provides roughly about 80 percent of the Delta inflow, which supports the Delta ecosystem and Delta diversions. These often competing demands on this limited resource has brought us to the point where operation and management of the system are becoming increasingly inflexible, due to several things. Due to increase in water use within the region, due to increase in Delta diversions and exports, and due to increase in recognition of environmental water needs.

Meanwhile, in May of 1995, CALFED began to develop a comprehensive, a long-term comprehensive plan to restore ecological health and improve water management of the Bay-Delta system. The CALFED program is a collaborative effort including representatives of the agricultural, urban, environmental, business interests, tribal interests, and other local interests. The CALFED program or effort is coordinated with local leadership and focus on regional solutions.

In the summer of 2000, CALFED published a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, an Environmental Impact Report, and a Record of Decision with an action specific long-term plan. The CALFED solution covers six region areas, regions, including the Sacramento River region, our area of interest. In the Record of Decision, the CALFED agencies concluded that storage can be used to help achieve the CALFED objectives, and more specifically that storage is essential to the success -- is critical to the successful implementation of all aspects of the CALFED program. And that storage can help achieve the program, and that storage can help provide system much needed flexibility.

Also in the Record of Decision. CALFED identified Sites Reservoir, which is one of our North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage projects, as one of five surface storage projects statewide for continued evaluation. So for North-of-the-Delta Offstream storage, in order to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act, the California Environmental Quality Act, and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, we will look at Sites Reservoir, as well as a reasonable range of alternatives.

Concurrent with the North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage program, these are some of the other major programs that are ongoing in the Sacramento Valley, and they are including

Sacramento Valley Water Management Agreement, also known as Phase 8 Settlement Agreement; the Sacramento Valley Basinwide Management Plan; the CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program; Sacramento River Conservation Area, also known as SB 1086; and the Sacramento/San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study, and other CALFED Stage 1 surface and groundwater storage actions.

The Record of Decision also identified specific objectives for a North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage. Those objectives include enhance water management flexibility in the Sacramento Valley; reduce diversions on the Sacramento River during critical fish migration periods; increase reliability of supplies for a major portion of the Sacramento Valley; and, finally, provide storage and operational benefits for other CALFED programs, such as the Delta Water Quality and the Environmental Water Account.

In order to help us understand how a North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage would affect the current system, and how North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage objectives will be accomplished, it is helpful to do a comparison of the system with and without a North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage. This is a simplified graphic showing the existing system with a number of important water resources facilities, including Shasta Reservoir, Oroville Reservoir, Folsom Reservoir, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta area.

In the following slides we will focus on in this area, north of Sacramento Valley, that's highlighted here. This slide indicates the current operation system without an offstream storage, and focused on the two major Sacramento River water users, the Tehama-Colusa Canal, the Glenn Irrigation District Canal. During the wintertime, when the flow in the river is relatively high, as depicted by the thicker line that represent the river, diversions through the canals are relatively low, as depicted by the thin canal lines, representing canal.

Again, the current operation, without offstream storage in the summertime, now there's a large agricultural demand in these service areas, so diversions through these canals are relatively high, while flow in the river is relatively low.

Now, with an offstream storage, during the wintertime when flow in the river is relatively high, we can divert some of the water and put it into an offstream storage. That water can either come from the Sacramento River and/or its tributaries. This bucket depicted here represents any type of a storage.

Now, an operation with an offstream storage in the summertime, during high demand times when these canals water users' demands are high, with water storage, the offstream storage, we have an alternative source of water to meet these water users' demands. Again, with an offstream storage, offstream storage can provide partial water deliveries from an offstream storage to these canals and, so with an offstream can improve the water supply reliability to these water users and at the same time reduce diversions from the Sacramento River during critical fish migration periods.

Now, let's look back at the larger system. Look at the water management flexibility for water – an offstream storage. Preliminary operation studies show that with an offstream storage, we can take water from an offstream storage, we can improve storage in Shasta Reservoir, Oroville Reservoir, and Folsom Reservoir, as well. In fact, with an offstream storage, we can even improve locally managed groundwater storage. Consistent with CALFED's vision for a North-of-the-Delta Offstream

Storage, an offstream storage can provide benefits for other CALFED programs, as I mentioned earlier, including Delta water quality and the amount of water count.

In summary, the North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage can provide an opportunity for balanced solutions with ecosystem benefits and groundwater use, agricultural water use, municipal water use, and industrial water use.

In the CALFED Record of Decision there are two major milestones or steps. Step one was to create a partnership with local water interests. And step two is to complete environmental review and planning documentation by August 2004.

For the first step, create partnership with local water interests, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed initially in November 2000, with several local water interests. Subsequently, other local water interests have joined and signed the MOU, and today we have 11 local water interests who signed a Memorandum of Understanding. The Memorandum of Understanding remains an open document, which means any local water interests who wish to join the planning process can still sign the Memorandum of Understanding.

With the 11 local water interests, we have five CALFED agencies, including three federal agencies and two state agencies. The three federal agencies included in there is the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, which is the lead agency for complying with the National Environmental Policy Act. And then the state agencies includes the Department of Water Resources, which is the state lead agency for complying with the California Environmental Quality Act.

Step two of the Record of Decision is to complete environmental review and planning documentation by August 2004. We have, Department of Water Resources and the local planning partnership, planned to prepare a site specific Environmental Impact Statement and Report, and the Environmental Impact Statement and Report will be based on the final program, final CALFED Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement and Report, where appropriate.

The Notice of Preparation and Notice of intent are the first steps for the planning environmental documenting processes. And for the North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage project, the Notice of Preparation was filed with the State Clearinghouse in November 2001, and the Notice of Intent was also filed with the state -- the Federal Register in November of 2001.

Included in the Notice of Preparation are some of the possible project alternatives. They include a No Project, Present Condition; No Action, Future Condition; a Sites Reservoir Alternative; a Newville Reservoir Alternative; and Other Possible Alternatives, including conjunctive use, enlarging Shasta, and other alternatives that may be developed during the Scoping Process. Now that the scoping is really next phases of the formal process of the environmental documentation process. And now that it is -- that your comments are most helpful in this process, that we are asking you specifically, are there any additional alternatives that we should be looking at in our evaluation, and are there other possible effects of these alternatives that we should be looking at? As far as the scoping meetings, scoping really provides an opportunity for the public and agencies to provide comments to us on the alternatives that we discuss, and any other possible alternatives that you may think of., and so we scheduled three scoping meetings in three geographical areas. We had a scoping meeting yesterday in Sacramento, tonight's is Maxwell, and then we'll have another one next week in Fresno. After the scoping meetings and the end of the comments period, we will be preparing a report to summarize the comments we receive and the alternatives, and determining on the alternatives to carry forward in our processes. We will then begin to write the environmental documentation.

So the opportunity for the public to involve is to attend the scoping meetings, and we ask that you submit your comments by January the 25th, this month, and again, on the alternatives that we presented and the possible effects, and then the alternatives that you come up with and their possible effects, please submit it to us. We ask that you submit your comments either at the scoping meetings, such as tonight, or submit it to us in writing or through the mail or fax. There will be opportunities, regular opportunities for the public to participate in continued outreach meetings that we're going to have during the environmental documentation process later on.

So we ask that you contact Scott Woodland who is our contact back there for receiving comments. His business cards are in the back of the table if you wish to obtain one so you can send him your comments later, and/or fax. All this information is on his business card.

So I want to thank you, and turn it back to Gwen.

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Thank you. And thank you for listening to Sean at this point. Now it's the main part of the meeting, is to obtain comments. Once again, I'm asking that -- we're going --

because what we're doing on all of these projects, or in all these scoping meetings, is we're recording the comments that we're getting. And tonight's meeting, we're recording them through the tape recorder here, so we're asking for people to come up here and use the microphone, which is why I need a speaker's card so that I can sort of control the flow of all the commentators.

The other part about this is that in that Scoping Report, which is the document that Sean mentioned about summarizing, there will be copies of all of the written comments. There will be copies of the transcripts that are made from the scoping meetings, as well as the responses, and they'll be organized in the Scoping Report. We'll also include in the Scoping Report copies of the presentation that was just done, and copies of the notice of publication, of the Notice of Intent and Notice of Preparation type things.

So, I have some comment cards. We're about ready to start comments. I want to know if anybody would also like to add to my pile of comment cards and didn't get an opportunity. Scott, could you -- or Jim has them here. And if you can just fill those out we'll collect them, and while you guys are doing this, if anybody else hasn't, the requirement is raise your hand and Jim will both give the cards and collect them.

And at this time I'd like to have our first commentator, that's Assemblyman Dickerson.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKERSON: Talking to you guys, right? With your permission, before I do that, I'd like to recognize that Senator Johannessen, Maurice Johannessen, has joined us. I also, with your permission, if he would like to make some comments at this time, come on up. Maurice has been a valiant fighter for the water situation in the State of California for a number of years, and I know he probably has some interesting things to share with you here tonight. Maurice.

SENATOR JOHANNESSEN: Thank you. Well, I don't know how interesting they are, but there's some questions that I need to ask those here from CALFED, whether or not they had the opportunity to read the report that my committee put out after about four or five years' worth of hearings. Has anybody read it?

That answers my question. That is one of the problems that we're dealing with, because it seems to me that over this period of time, including the EIR and Scoping and the ROD, no one really had an opportunity to see or find out what was happening before it was passed. And, in fact, I was with the Governor at the time, and I asked him about this, and he says no problem. And they had me on the front steps there on the Capitol, smiling with him, and they passed a ROD, and I said what did we pass. So that's another question.

But I -- the interesting thing on this, which I think we need to make sure we understand, that is in the original -- well, I guess now you have 20 members in CALFED, the program itself? I don't know how you herd that many cats. But there used to be 13, then it was 14, and now it is 20. I don't know who's on first. And for those of you that may remember that the original -- the original commitments, those two original commitments that was made, one was that there would be no redirected impacts.

Now, what do we mean by redirected impact. Do you think by buying land in northern California, buy farming land in northern California, by buying water rights, even you disguise it as development rights, development easement, environmental easement, et cetera,

et cetera, do you think that has an impact on the local communities? Of course it does. Is this being taken into consideration? I haven't seen any reports on that yet.

The other thing which I am somewhat concerned about is the beneficiary pays. Who is the beneficiary? Certainly not we; we got the water. The beneficiary, it's got to be MWD and some of these other people south of us. With all the things that we now do, are we now going to be have to pay, on top of the fact that we do have the water? So that's some of the things that we need to take a look at.

Now, one of the things I noticed in the information that was sent out, that there's very little deviation that can be made from the ROD, the Record of Decision that was made, and then all this has to do with is how do we implement, or how do we decide what to do with the things that are being done, which is basically surface storage or storage and transportation. So none of the information that was available before no longer can be used in this area, so we'll be limited now basically to talk about only the storage part of it.

The other thing which is sort of an interesting thing, in here they state that the water use within the region are expected to increase driven primarily by a projected 2020 population of almost four million people. I guess that must be only in northern California they're talking about. Is that what is being talked about? Well, it is interesting, because after five -- four years, or five years of hearings of my committee which I chair, we have pretty well determined that California is going to have somewhere in the area of 50 million people in 2025-2030. So I don't know where the four million people coming from.

And for those who may be interested, we are talking about perhaps 1.9 million acre-feet, and the yield is substantially less than that. The other thing that you have to bear in mind when we deal with storage is that we are already somewhere between one and two million acre-feet short of deliveries. We estimate that it's going to take somewhere between six to nine million acre-feet of additional water in order to serve the needs that's going to be brought forth in the next 25 to 30 years. I obviously won't be here, but I hope the grandkids will.

So when you deal with this issue, the amount of water that is being talked about stored, for example, in Shasta Dam, which is somewhere around -- I can't even remember now exactly whether we're talking about the amount, but it was about a third of that is actually the yield. So when you're talking about storing capacity, we better start talking about what is the yield. What does it take to have the yield. And what will the cost for the -- of that yield be, and who's going to pay for it.

So keep track of these things, because I -- and I'd be the first one to tell you, it is just amazing, after all these years as chairing that committee, that I find that these reports -- which, incidentally, has gone to the federal government, going to all our representatives, I mean, it is widely distributed, I think we got something like five or six thousand copies out, and they're widely used -- and I have yet, I have yet to find a member of the CALFED group that can tell me they have read it. These are expert's opinions that have been delivered over a period of four or five years. What the hell's going on?

Anyway, you got it. Thank you.

(Applause.)

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKERSON: Okay. With that, I will present my comments. I've also been asked by Secretary of State Bill Jones to read his comments, which have been submitted to you in writing also. So with your permission, I'll do so.

I have long been a champion for new surface storage in California, and particularly Sites Reservoir here on the west side of the Sacramento Valley. Tonight is a historic night when we begin the process that will hopefully lead to building of this important offstream reservoir. The Second Assembly District I currently represent is a significant portion of the Sacramento Valley, including the area in which Sites Reservoir is located. Nearly two-thirds of the state's water supplies come from these watersheds. This is a very important agricultural

region that also serves as a seasonal wetlands for migrating waterfowls, shorebirds, and other wildlife.

California is now growing by nearly 600,000 people a year. Additionally, over the past several decades our state has dedicated millions of acre-feet of water to environmental purposes. Despite these increasing demands for water, we haven't developed the infrastructure that will be necessary to meet the needs of the numerous demands for water in California. We cannot wait until there is a crisis like we saw in the Klamath Basin this past year, where farmers, birds, and communities suffered. We must begin the efforts that are necessary to build new infrastructure in California, and we must do it now.

Surface storage in California, and particularly Sites Reservoir, provides the best opportunity to provide water security for all Californians. This is an opportunity to locally manage and operate a surface storage project in our region. This project will provide water management flexibility to make sure that we meet the needs of cities, farms, and the environment in northern California.

Specifically, it will give us the flexibility to provide additional cold water for salmon and steelhead from other sources serving the Sacramento River watershed, while at the same time helping to meet the needs of food and domestic water of a growing California population.

Finally, it has the potential to provide additional wetland habitat and water oriented recreation. As the elected representative from this area, I stand ready today to assist the efforts that are necessary to advance Sites Reservoir and provide water security for this region and for the entire state. I am deeply committed, even in these difficult budget times, to work with my colleagues to fully fund necessary infrastructure improvements in California, including surface storage like Sites Reservoir.

Foremost in your planning and design should be to ensure that sufficient water from Sites is available and affordable for local agricultural, community, and environmental use needs, as considerations are given to the other part of the state.

I think it's -- we're approaching the time, ladies and gentlemen, when we need to start -- stop talking, and start building. I want to know who brought the rebar tonight. Anybody bring rebar?

Let me now read a letter that was prepared by Secretary of State Bill Jones. It reads as follows.

"I strongly support the joint efforts of the Department of Water Resources and the CALFED Bay Delta program to move ahead with all aspects of the Sites Reservoir projects. During the initial discussion of establishment of the CALFED, Senator Costa and I insisted that water storage facilities be an integral feature of the Delta plan.

"I strongly urged that a Sites Reservoir be the first of a series of water storage projects that need to be built to show the CALFED partnership that northern California water interests would be protected. Collaborative efforts such as these are necessary to live up to the promise of CALFED; namely, that we all get well together. I am deeply concerned that the CALFED process has become vulcanized. It is through efforts like the one you are considering now that we can reestablish the statewide leadership that is necessary to get us back on track, notwithstanding a Record of Decision that so many have found inadequate for that purpose.

I believe this project, if ultimately constructed, will be a first step towards providing the kind of water supply reliability that is so desperately needed for California to live up to its responsibility to be a steward of our environmental resources.

"Again, this project would be tangible evidence that the state will take a leadership role in this issue. While our infrastructure is crumbling and failing to meet the needs of our growing state, state sponsorship of a water project has been virtually non-existent. Local

districts have been doing what they can to meet their needs, but this is a statewide issue that requires statewide leadership.

"I had the opportunity to join with you, Mr. Director" -- these comments are directed to Director Hannigan -- "and our colleagues, to unanimously support AB 2315 in 1993 that led to this joint endeavor. I have been involved from the earliest stages as a supporter of CALFED efforts, and I was the joint author of Proposition 204, the largest environmental water bond of its kind, when it was proposed in 1996. That served as a down payment on this unique state/federal partnership.

"I'm also uniquely qualified to comment on this process because I am personally familiar with water issues and how CALFED actions affect California's future. I come from a farm next to Mendota, in western Fresno County. My parents, my brother, and one of my daughters and her husband still farm that ground, and I still hold an interest in a portion of the farm. Our farm relies upon water delivered by the Firebaugh Canal Company and Westlands Water District.

"My father served on the State Water Commission during the 1960's, when the state saw a renaissance in state infrastructure building, including water development projects. My father also served on the boards of the Firebaugh Canal Company and the San Luis and Delta-Mendota Water Authority for many years. In those roles, he has been a leader in the efforts to secure a reliable long-term water supply for California vital to agricultural industry.

"But apart from those personal interests, I am involved and interested as a citizen and as a policy-maker who has a long held interest and a deep appreciation for the importance of water issues, and an understanding of their many complexities. It is in that spirit and with that understanding that I urge you to move ahead with the planning for and construction of this Offstream Storage project. As those familiar with the water issues are well aware, the DWR assessment of California water needs shows California's supply infrastructure fall short of meeting our needs even in the years of average rainfall. At any time we are literally one drought away from a water crisis.

"It is difficult for policy-makers to explain to the public the year after they see the Yolo Causeway area flooded and the Sacramento River teeming from bank to bank why they must conserve water so the state can meet its most basic needs. Sites Reservoir, filled primarily with diversion from the Sacramento River during times of peak flow, will reduce the impact of pumping from valley conveyance systems during the summer months, and will allow for additional flows of salmon and steelhead during the critical times.

"This kind of a project is what California needs to begin managing its resources to meet urban and agricultural needs, instead of trying to manage the short-term crisis that" -- "the inevitable chronic crisis that will come with the state's projected growth.

"Thank you for considering these remarks, and I urge you to do all that you can to ensure that your decision is one more step forward towards the completion of this critical project.

"Bill Jones, California Secretary of State."

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Thank you, Assemblyman Dickerson. I'd like to -- I'm going through the comment cards here for speaker cards, and I'd like to have Mr. Reuben Williams, who's representing Assemblyman Aanestad.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, good evening, everyone. I'm honored to be here on behalf of Assemblyman Sam Aanestad to share with you that Sam does support the Sites Reservoir project. He is an endorser of that. And he would be very pleased to see the turnout here this evening. The fact that you all get civically engaged and come out to voice your opinion, and

to learn from Sean Sou and his informative presentation further about this project, shows a lot about your interest.

And the need somewhat that Senator Johannessen brought up that locals need to be listened to, and that you, since this is -- it's in your back yard, a lot of you are farmers. I spoke with Lorraine Corbin and her son, a lot of you know her, they grow rice and alfalfa locally, that the needs of agriculture, the needs of a growing population, and the importance of waterfowl all need to be addressed, and these are things that your state government needs to look at and to get behind. And Assemblyman Aanestad supports the Sites Reservoir.

So I just wanted to say thank you for coming out, and please be heard, and get your cards in. So have a good evening.

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Before the next speaker I just wanted to let everybody know there's about 10 or 12 seats sporadically placed around in the first few rows. If anybody would like to have a seat feel free to move on up. Right now we'd like to have Mr. Bill Borrer, from Tehama County Board of Supervisors.

MR. BORRER: Thank you.

I would like to go back a few years. It was 1995 that I was -- volunteered to be a Supervisor, and the first thing that came across my desk I think was something about CALFED. And there was a figure in there, I think it was a million acre-feet of groundwater was going to come out of the Sacramento Valley for the CALFED needs. That got me and our board excited, and we formed a committee. And we had a great leader in our groundwater engineer at that point in time, Dan Keppen, who most of you know. Formed an advisory committee to get some input into CALFED. After a few meetings we decided we needed to expand that.

Over a couple of years we got seven counties involved, and I think you all know who those are. Came up with some definite policy statements about water storage, environmental needs, and groundwater. And it was the unanimous consent of all those counties, they all took action on it, to support all of those policy statements, and the one on storage definitely supported a offstream storage project, which at that point had not been identified. But since then, at least our county has been a strong supporter of the Sites Reservoir project, and hope that it goes forward.

I think when you get into these scoping sessions there will probably be some environmental concerns, but it's our opinion that some of all the environmental impacts will be positive for fish and wildlife and their habitat, and will definitely be positive to the environment of the population of the valley, as well as to the Bay Delta, which is what CALFED is supposed to be all about.

I'd like to look at the long term. I'm -- but years are going by and I'm not probably going to benefit too much from Sites Reservoir, but I just don't understand the thinking of some people when they don't get behind a storage in this state. Shasta Dam was certainly somebody's wild dream back in the 1930's, and look what it's done for the state, and where would we be without it. If we look 40 years down the road and the water needs of the state are certainly going to be probably beyond our comprehension even at this point in time, and this little project is just a start. But at least it'll be a start. There hasn't been any storage built in the state, I think, since Oroville Dam, and we need to get started.

The gentleman that started asked for comments about alternatives. And I live on the bank of the Sacramento River in Tehama, and we all know that that floods every time the water comes up. At least from the flood management department they say it floods. It even flooded last week, but I didn't see it. So when they get Sites built, I want them to think about going back to Cottonwood where the water is, and maybe we can get an offstream storage built and we can go back and do one that really has some impact.

If I could turn the mic off and say something, I think that we need to get started on this and get it done, because Senator Dickerson's going -- might be out of office before we get it dedicated.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Thank you. The next person is Mr. Keith Hansell, from the Glenn County Board of Supervisors.

MR. HANSELL: Yeah. I would like to say that Glenn County thoroughly supports Sites Reservoir. It has so many attributes that we just -- we have to have it. As I've stated before, we haven't developed any water, but this will do a lot for the flood control, too, in the district. I understand water will be taken out of Colusa Trough, which will really add to the protection of flood downstream in the trough. It will help the groundwater, it will help the environment, the wildlife. I just can't see any negatives in this whole program.

It's really nice to see the concept of the local input from the local districts. They're the ones that can manage the local efforts and the needs, and meet the needs of the local people. It's a good concept. We just, I think we need to get this one built and get on to something else. The only negative I can see in this whole project is the time it takes to get it built.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Thank you. The next card is from Mr. Forrest Sprague, from the Glenn County Board of Supervisors.

MR. SPRAGUE: Well, good evening. I likewise appreciate everybody turning out. This is your government in action, if it will, or maybe some might consider it inaction. But you want to take the opportunity to express your opinions of this, pro or con, on this particular project here tonight.

I, like Bill Borrer, I go back to originally seeing CALFED, when CALFED came out people thought CALFED was a bank and Metropolitan was a life insurance company. We all know a little better than that now. And one of the things that when it was first was crafted, if I recall it was about 6500 pages long, and at that time addressed only five elements. I think it was water quality, water reliability, ecosystem restoration, flood control, and levee integrity, if I recall. Only five elements. We've got now seven, I think, that includes storage.

But when it did first come out, at that time I was Chief of Staff for Senator Johannessen, and he put it upon my shoulders to start studying that document, 6500 pages. And what I soon discovered, as many of us did, that all the objectives identified in the CALFED Bay-Delta program, in that original EIR all things got better with storage. Ecosystem restoration, water quality, water reliability, flood control, all things got better with storage.

I'm very pleased to see the demonstration that we saw tonight, showing that continual nexus between storage and all of those elements of CALFED, because all things will get better with storage in the CALFED Bay-Delta program.

So I guess my comments would be addressed to those that still remain opposed to seeing Sites Reservoir. Most of those people embrace and support all the objectives found in the CALFED Bay-Delta program. However, some of them still remain opposed to storage. I would recommend to those people that they start looking at this realistically. If they are, in fact, concerned about the environment, water quality, water reliability, then they've got to support the storage element, as well. Anything less than that, in my opinion, is hypocritical.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Thank you. Our next speaker is Doug LaMalfa.

Mr. LaMALFA: Thank you. I'm a rice farmer from Butte County. I'm not a politician. I am, since parking the harvesters in October, I have started the run for the State Assembly.

As many of you also are rice farmers, we have a pretty common understanding of the value and the need of a constant water supply. Sites Reservoir will be one important component of that water supply. We need to get going on it, speed up the glacial pace that we get things done in this state with adding to the water supply.

With that, I won't be repetitive here, but I will go on record as being absolutely for the largest capacity Sites Reservoir we can have.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Mr. David Guy, from --okay. Ms. Mary Wells.

MS. WELLS: Thank you. This year marks the beginning of my 25th year as being very involved with water issues locally, and actually statewide. I have served as a staff member at Westside Water District for many years, and have moved on to directorships at Westside, Maxwell Irrigation, and I have served on the TC Authority for many years, as well as one of the founding directors at NCWA.

Water, of course, has consumed a major part of my life.

As current chairman of NCWA, I just recently participated in the historic Phase 8 of Statement of Principles Agreement. And if that is going to succeed, and there is out of that going to become a long-term solution to not only the north state, but the rest of the state, Sites or an offstream storage facility is going to be critical to that resolution.

In terms of my participation in the TC Authority, we need to better utilize not only our water resource up here, but we mustn't forget the facility resource that we have all invested in, and that is the Tehama-Colusa Canal and the GCID Canal. My family also owns land and participated in GCID, as well. So I think these are things that need to be considered. Existing facilities are critical to make this project work.

One of the main things that I've experienced in the last 25 years is the ever looming threat of water shortages. As a manager, it was critical every year, and I was -- particularly experienced through the nineties, when we would come out with preliminary predictions from the bureau of 10 percent, 15 percent, most of you are farmers here, you know that you cannot plan your cropping year with 10 percent and 15 percent. It would sometimes go up as high as 25 percent. We were all over the board, 15, 25 percent, 35 percent supply year, up to 100, back down to a 60. We have got to resolve this.

And it is only going to get worse. From '95 to the year 2000, we had relatively wet years and up along the TC, the Bureau of Reclamation, we were only able to receive 60 percent of our supply. And it isn't going to get better. We need offstream storage.

One of the reasons that I was particularly interested in the Memorandum of Understanding, the concept of meeting local needs first, is that the local people and their input was to be very, very important in this process. Unlike when the TC was built, and other earlier facilities, the bureau came along and told us how it was going to be, and we tried to comply. And, frankly, I've been trying to comply for 25 years. I would really like to have something to say about how this can be resolved. Very critical.

One of the things that has come out since the Memorandum of Understanding is that as a landowner, of all places, in Sites, I happen to have my home there, a couple of rangeland

operations, it's a wonderful place to live. I do not relish the thought of having to leave there. But I will tell you that if my family is to continue in their farming operations in GCID, along the TC, and the Maxwell Irrigation District, we have got to see additional reliable water supply. It's critical.

So with that in mind, I was instrumental, with some of the other landowners, to get the group together, and we will test this. Will landowners have input? So far, they have. We've had a couple of landowner meetings, and out of one of -- or, I should say, the first landowner meeting, we asked that this meeting be held here in this town, because this is where a lot of people are going to be impacted. And I thank DWR for listening to us, and having this meeting here. I do appreciate that.

But we will be testing you on a lot of other issues, such as when you get into the scoping considerations, you have told us that this is going to be open and inclusive. And I hope it will be, because, please remember, when you consider the Sites Reservoir alternative in your scoping, please consider that, of course, there will be landowners that are -- that will need to be relocated, that are definitely in the footprint. And I happen to be one of those species, if you will.

But there are also some other considerations. There are landowners who will have remaining land around the reservoir. When you are doing scoping and you are looking into the impacts of this, please consider the input of those landowners who have remaining land. They need to plan as to whether they need to relocate where they live, or what kind of utilization and how are they going to get to that property, which brings to mind, of course, access. Please consider those issues. And who better to call upon but the people who live there and know the land. So it's very important that those things be taken into consideration.

The other one is, of course, recreation will probably be a part of this. When you do get into the scoping of this alternative, please call upon and ask for the input of people who know best how that might work. It all ties in sort of a circle, if it is and will work, as to what the remaining land uses can be, the environmental impacts of the deer and the animals that are there, and those few species who may want to relocate. So I'm asking you, relative to scoping, please consider those things.

I'd like to close by saying that I do appreciate the structure, the direct line to the project management team that landowners have been afforded. And I ask each and every one of you that may potentially be impacted to speak up, call us. We will have continued landowner meetings.

Again, I'm going to say along with the water and the facilities that I've talked about is the people here who are probably equally an important resources to make this project work.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Pat Minturn, from Shasta County.

MR. MINTURN: Good evening. I'm Pat Minturn, the Shasta County Public Works Director.

Shasta County thinks storage is good, the benefits are needed, and Sites is probably superior to all the alternatives here in the north state. But I'd like to talk for a moment about the no action, no project alternative. It has profound impacts, and the impacts of the no action alternative always seem to be underestimated in these environmental documents. Oh, it'll work out. No. The impacts of not building, of not going forward, of the no action alternative, will hurt. They'll be real. For M&I, ag, environmental, flood control, power, recreation, and export, somebody is going to get hurt if this thing doesn't get built.

If we build it, there will still be pain, but we'll have some options. We can manage it somewhat. Overall, if you're not in a position to manage the impacts, if you don't have any options, the overall community impact for all of California, especially for here, the impact is greater. So these environmental documents, it's been my experience, are very good at finding all the problems with a proposed project. I'd like to see that same level of detail applied to the no action, no project alternative. No vague escapes. Explain what the future will look like without this project. How will that all work, how will all those needs be met. Own up to the damages in the no action alternative. And then, build it.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Mr. John Byrne.

MR. BYRNE: I'm John Byrne, and I'm running for the State Assembly. And why we're all here tonight is one of the reasons that I am running. We haven't developed any water storage for a long, long time. It's absolutely necessary, and it's imperative that we move forward with this project as quickly as we can.

It maybe isn't as big of a project as many of us would like. We'd like to see a lot more storage developed around northern California. But it is a project that we have and we can get moving on right away. So one thing that I would just like to ask with all of us here tonight, to the CALFED people, what can we do to make sure that we move this project forward as a group as quickly as we can. So if you can tell us also how to help you, we would be there for you.

So, thanks very much.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Pat Knight.

MAYOR KIGHT: Okay. Can I -- show of hands, anybody who's not running for office?

(Laughter.)

MAYOR KIGHT: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Pat Knight.

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Sorry.

MAYOR KIGHT: That's okay. So am I, sometimes. I'm the Mayor of the City of Redding, and I also am a candidate for the Second District that Dickerson now holds. We're all getting to be very good friends here.

(Laughter.)

MAYOR KIGHT: As a resident of the Sacramento Valley for the past 31 years, I've long valued the water resources in northern California, and I'm deeply committed to the efforts that are necessary to protect our water rights and to be able to fully utilize our waters for the farms, for the cities, local communities, and for fish and wildlife in our region.

It's no secret that California is now adding nearly 600,000 people per year to this great state. Additionally, our state has dedicated millions of acre-feet of water to meet environmental needs, and yet while these demands have grown, the state has not developed the infrastructure that'll be necessary to meet the numerous demands for water in California. We simply cannot wait for a crisis like we saw this past year in the Klamath Basin. We must focus our energies to build new infrastructure to not only keep pace with the demands, but to stay ahead of it.

Although I'm primarily here tonight to listen, I want the people to know that I'm deeply committed to new surface storage in California, and particularly the Sites Reservoir. I'm also committed to local control and management of our water resources, and as your Assemblyman I will immediately forge alliances with other elected officials around the state to fund the important infrastructure that's critical to meet these demands in the state, including Sites Reservoir.

So I join you tonight in expressing my belief that tonight is historic. As we embark on the process that should lead to building a new important offstream reservoir.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Steve Evans, Friends of the River.

MR. EVANS: Good evening. I appreciate being here tonight and hearing all the great comments.

Just a little background. I'm Conservation Director of Friends of the River. We're the state's largest

river conservation group, with 6,000 members. I, in the last couple of years, have been serving on the Department of Water Resources Technical Advisory Group for the North of Delta Offstream Storage studies, so I'm fairly familiar with these projects. And I've been a long-time resident of northern California, including a 20-year resident of Chico, before I moved to Sacramento.

When we look at North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage, there's several major questions that have to be asked, and these are the questions I think need to be posed in the CEQA and NEPA document, and answered in those documents. Probably one of the foremost questions is how much water will the Sites or Newville projects reliably produce, particularly when you consider the realistic environmental constraints. Estimates have been made, but they vary widely. And it's reliable production of water that we're looking for out of these projects, not estimates.

Another major question is how will that water be used. Will it go to agriculture, will it go to urban water users, will it be used for the environment. There's needs in all those sectors, certainly. But it depends, those sectors are defined differently, depending on who you talk to. I've heard urban users in the Sacramento Valley define environmental water as water use that would replace the water used for endangered species currently, or required by the Central Valley Project Improvement Act for the environment as a replacement. And that's a zero sum game. I've heard urban water users south of the Delta define environmental water as water that goes to the Delta that allows them to pump more water out of the Delta. So let's define what environmental water is before we say hey, let's build this project to benefit the environment.

How much will the project actually cost? In the initial studies the cost is varying widely from a half billion dollars to well over a billion, depending on how big it is, how -- what new facilities are constructed to divert the water and transport the water. And then, finally, who will pay for the water. One estimate places the cost of this water at \$450 an acre-foot, which no agricultural user in California can afford to pay. Are we going to build this project so that southern California urban users can use all the water, is the question, since they are actually the only entity in the state now who can afford to buy water at \$450 an acre-foot.

Other important questions need to be answered. Can substantial amounts of water be diverted from the Sacramento River without harming its dynamic meandering ecosystem, which the restoration of is a major CALFED goal, as well as the river's threatened and endangered fish and wildlife. This is a very important question. High flows in the Sacramento River, the very flows targeted for diversion to fill these offstream reservoirs, are

the flows that cause the river to meander back and forth to erode and deposit, to recreate riparian habitat. That dynamic process that you see occurring today is what makes the Sacramento River one of the most healthiest rivers in the Central Valley.

In comparison, the San Joaquin River, which has most of its water diverted out of the river, something like over 90 percent, is virtually a dead river that sustains no runs of salmon and steelhead. So how much water we divert from the Sacramento River and when we divert it will be a very key, crucial issue to determine. And the problem is we don't know at this point, and it may take several years to conduct studies to even come up with a ballpark answer. I urge the Department of Water Resources and other supporters of this project to slow down and really seriously look at that issue before charging forward.

What are the direct impacts of building offstream storage reservoirs in the Sites and Newville Valleys? We have some basic numbers, something like 14,000 acres would be inundated in the Sites Valley. Don't have the acreage for Newville. But there are some other impacts for those projects. The Newville project, for example, would require a diversion from Thomes Creek, which has a marginal steelhead run. But both the state and federal agencies have a legislative mandate to double salmon and steelhead runs in the state. Can we afford to create more impediments on even marginal tributaries like Thomes Creek that would keep us from achieving those goals.

Perhaps a more esoteric question, what is the potential for reservoir induced seismicity from the Sites Reservoir, in particular. The Sites Reservoir sits on a vast fault system that has produced catastrophic faults in the past, as the communities of Winters and Coalinga can attest. We can build dams to withstand the likely earthquakes in that fault system, but the question is can buildings here in Maxwell, for example, unreinforced masonry historic buildings, withstand earthquakes that could be induced by the sheer weight of a million acre-feet or more of water. Reservoir induced seismicity is a real issue. It -- Oroville Reservoir caused an earthquake in Oroville on a fault that wasn't even known of, and it's been proven over throughout the world in various sites. So it's one that really has to be taken a look at, particularly when we're on such an active fault as here on the west side of the Sacramento Valley.

Then, finally, what are the alternatives to building new surface storage. Groundwater storage, a conjunctive use, water use efficiency, and mandatory water conservation. I'm going to say something here tonight that's not going to be very popular, but that's because last week I said something in Sacramento that wasn't very popular. I informed the good citizens of Sacramento that they can no longer -- they were getting to the point where they can no longer use water at a flat rate, that every person using water in California has to have their water metered, and purchase water by volume. And the same is true for agricultural users in the Sacramento Valley.

There are many programs that need to be implemented that allow us to more efficiently use our existing water supplies and conserve water, and extend those water supplies. Some areas, including areas that have been -- particularly in northern California, don't have much of a good reputation. The Los Angeles area, for example, grew by over a million people in the last 15 years, and still using the same amount of water that they did 15 years ago. They did that through aggressive and mandatory water efficiency and conservation programs. That needs to be used statewide. We always need to conserve water. At no time can we allow ourselves to waste water.

I'll be submitting more detailed comments, but I just need to close. There have been various comments tonight about how long it's been since we built new water storage in the state, and I just have to mention that, in fact, we've built a lot of new water storage in the last several years. The Diamond Valley Dam, the state's largest offstream storage reservoir, built in southern California by the Metropolitan Water District, paid for by the Metropolitan Water District, who are the beneficiaries of that project. The Los Vaqueros Offstream Storage Reservoir near the Delta, built and paid for by the Contra Costa Water District and its users.

Projects are being built by the people who need them, and they're being paid for by the people who need them, and that's an important concept to keep in mind.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: The next person I'd like to call is Marian Mathis. Did I get your name right?

MS. MATHIS: You sure did.

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Oh, good.

MS. MATHIS: I'd just like to start by saying that I'm not a candidate.

(Laughter.)

MS. MATHIS: I'm not an officeholder. My largest claim to fame is that I'm a landowner who will be impacted by the construction of the Sites Reservoir. And so one of the things that I want you to consider in the scoping process for that particular alternative is the access routes.

Now, we had a -- my husband and I had a meeting with a representative from the Department of Water Resources and a project engineer, and we suggested an alternate route that would not impact housing or prime ag ground, as the route now considered does. And so we want to make sure that that is included in the scoping process and is not shuffled off to the side, and that we have the same studies going on for that alternative route as we do for the footprint that we see right now. So that's our main concern at this particular time regarding the Sites Reservoir project.

However, I will say that if people need to pay for what they use, then it would be a really good idea for environmentalists to pay for their own projects.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Aileen Roder.

MS. RODER: Good evening. My name is Aileen Roder. I am a water policy analyst for Taxpayers for Common Sense, a non-profit national budget watchdog group.

As many long years of CALFED negotiations have shown us, in order for California's water future to be solved, the problems, we're going to have to all compromise. The CALFED Record of Decision issued in 2000 looked at several water projects as future potential projects that might be built and studied as to whether or not they will meet California's water needs. One of the main promises made to the federal taxpayer in the CALFED Record of Decision was that the beneficiary of projects would pay their fair share of building and maintaining those projects.

As California faces the future with a growing population, the state must thoroughly review projects to ensure that any proposed water projects are cost effective, fully cost justified, and that those benefiting from them are willing and able to pay their fair share of those projects.

In some instances, proposed projects have been studied multiple times and have never been built because they were unable to meet these important requirements. Taxpayers for Common Sense believes federal taxpayers should assist California in finding water solutions, but California and the primary beneficiaries of projects must take the lead in implementing and funding these solutions. Taxpayers cannot afford another Central Valley Project, where 60 years down the line the federal taxpayer has been stuck with over 85 percent of the bill. Californians must be willing to look at innovative solutions to help meet future water needs and pay their fair share.

The deal was if federal funds were going to be spent on these projects, then the beneficiaries and the state are going to have to come up with the funds, as well.

Thank you very much.

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Thank you. Ken Wells.

MR. WELLS: Hi, I'm Ken Wells, and I farm west of Maxwell, two miles from the Sites project. And on your scoping process, I'm a little concerned about what this dam will do to the groundwater level.

On my ranch alone, the groundwater is 12 to 15 feet in the summertime. In the wintertime it's about eight feet. And right south of my ranch, a neighbor of ours has an artesian in the middle of his ranch in the summertime.

Now, I'm just concerned what -- and don't get me wrong, I'm not against this -- I just want this to go through the scoping process that what a million acre-feet up behind us will do to this water level. And that's just something I hope we can check out.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Okay. I'm going to try, and I apologize if I mess this name up. Lynne Spivak.

MS. SPIVAK: That's very --

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: It's close.

MS. SPIVAK: Hi, there. I'm Lynne Spivak, and I am a candidate for Colusa County Treasurer and Tax Collector, as long as this is candidates' night.

My concern, and I would like to preface I am in favor of the project, but my concern is the removal of those properties from our tax base in Colusa, and the tax dollars that will be removed. And in looking at the surrounding properties and the land uses, look at how we might be able to make up those tax dollars so that Colusa County doesn't lose on that front.

And so in thinking about that mitigation, if you will keep in touch with our Board of Supervisors and let the county have input on how we're going to resolve that issue,

I would really appreciate it.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Ann Randless.

MS. RANDLESS: Good evening. My name is Ann Randless, and I represent this evening the Maxwell Unified School District and Superintendent Ron Turner. This is a very localized issue for us.

We're also concerned about access routes. In December of 1941, we had made an agreement with Stony Creek that if we ever unified we would always continue to take their students down to Maxwell, should they choose to do so. In September of 1963, we did unify. So, we are traveling their students down. And we did a very short survey today, or I did, to see what our losses would be to the school.

We have a \$3.875 million budget total. We have three schools, an elementary school, a high school, and a continuation school. We would lose -- right now these are only students in the Stonyford area. This does not include from Sites to Lodoga. We would lose 17 students at

the high school, and the total of the ADA there, the loss would be \$166,000. A 15 student loss at the elementary school would be a total of \$73,977. This runs to about \$240,000. This does not include, with your routing access, the direct impact on our buses if we would have to use what no one in this area fondly calls the Leadville Grade. We would be running through probably a bus a year if we had to use that.

So I would consider -- ask you to consider your direct access routes for us, like Ms. Mathis. And we will definitely be at all your meetings.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Kim Vann, from Congressman Ose's office.

MS. VANN: Well, Congressman Ose is running for reelection, but unfortunately, not in this district, as most of you know. But we will be here until 2003.

So I am pleased to be here this evening, and the Congressman would like to thank NCWA for putting together this forum -- excuse me -- and he would like me to reaffirm his commitment to offstream storage.

The Congressman feels that the North-of-the-Delta Offstream Storage serves multiple needs. First and foremost, security to our farmers, so that they have the water when they need the water. Second, flood control for downstream communities. Third, reserve storage for general community use. And, fourth, storage -- future and current environmental demands.

Congressman Ose is pleased to report that we have secured \$1.5 million in our 2002 appropriations for Sites Reservoir. We secured an earmark of \$750,000 under our energy and water appropriations for Sites Reservoir. Specifically, these funds will go to a Sites specific environmental assessment and permitting work, including the evaluation of both the GCID main canal and the Tehama-Colusa Canal as a means to convey water to the proposed reservoirs. We also secured \$750,000 within CALFED for planning of Sites Reservoir.

We know that there are many issues that will arise with the proposed Sites Reservoir, but we are committed to this project to see a reliable source of offstream storage for northern California.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Supervisor William Waite, from Colusa County.

MR. WAITE: I appreciate everyone coming tonight. It shows the importance of what this project. I hadn't initially intended to talk, but after the last few speakers I think I have to say a few words.

Actually, the last new reservoir north of Tehachapi is the New Melones. I know some of these people work for the State Department of Water Resources said their whole career they've never developed a dam project, and some of them have been there almost 30 years.

We need water. We're gaining probably 600,000 people a year, and close to 2,000 people a day. If we started that reservoir tomorrow, it'd probably be ten years before you'd be utilizing the water. They talk about utilizing the flood water. Well, ask the people 47 years ago in Yuba City what flood water does. There's an excess of flood water. How much -- if we started pumping out of that river during the flood, how much are we going to take off? That much? It might end up difference of going over the levees. That water that goes over the levees ain't helping anyone.

We need water. But basically, the water out of the Sites Reservoir won't be going to southern California, it's going to stay here, going to basically in the Tehama- Colusa Canal and the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation system. Water that isn't pumped from the Glenn-Colusa and Tehama-Colusa Canal will be going down the river for whatever uses they have, including the fish, environmental, southern California. But also, you better -- who is -- who's going to build it, who's going to pay for it in southern California? So we've got to be realistic. We got surplus water, send to them, get our project built.

We need more water projects in northern California. You don't realize, it'll be 2004 before the environmental report's even done. And then I don't know how many, a few years of litigation, and other things, four or five years of construction, and maybe two or three years of filling the dam up. Optimistically, probably 20 years before we'll ever use the dam, if we start now.

So you just got to -- we've got to have something. California has. I've been on the Board of Supervisors for 17 years. I've fought for water the whole time. And we need this project.

Thanks.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Bob Barkhouse. You did want to speak, didn't you? I didn't realize this. Bob Barkhouse, from the City of Yuba City.

MR. BARKHOUSE: Currently, the Vice-Mayor of Yuba City. And you probably are thinking what in the hell is he doing clear over here. But what's happening here has a direct impact on what we're doing over on the other side of the valley.

The City of Yuba City currently is 45,000 people, and the crystal balls that people use to tell us what the population's going to be says that Yuba City will be over 100,000 people by year 2020. So that's only 20 years. Our problem is that we get our water out of the river, and the Feather River has similar problems as the Sacramento River. It has a lot of water going down it in the wintertime, and little or nothing going down in the summertime. And so our problem is that in year 2010, a lot of our water contracts that we currently have are going to have to be renegotiated, and whether we can swing the same original people that we had contracts with or not is going to be questionable.

So we're faced with a doubling of the population, not only in the City of Yuba City do we have 40,000, but around the outside of the city we have an urban moat of another 30,000. So if you double that, and we have, by year 2010, we're going to be faced with a serious situation, where are we going to get the water.

Now, I am also a farmer, so I know the farm side of this issue, also. But I think the reason I'm up here, and I want it to be on tape, that I think that you should, as the process proceeds, use the information you have as a model to look at other offstream storage units, so that we don't have to take each one of these and make a 20-year fight or a 30-year fight to move on to the next one. So if we can learn from this one, and proceed to the next ones, because I have no doubt in my mind we're going to have to conserve the water by storing it somewhere either onstream or offstream.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: At this time I do not have anymore speaker cards. Is there anybody else in the audience that would like to speak? We need to -- let us get a card and we'll start there. Anybody else, while we take a couple of seconds here to work this out?

While that's being filled out, let me also remind you, please, if you have not signed on the mailing list, there will be subsequent workshop meetings all through the process. We'd like to notify you personally, and we can only do that through the process on the mailing list.

John Garner.

MR. GARNER: I, again, am not running for office. In fact, it's interesting to me how many people in the audience are just farming landowners. I hope they're here, because I'm speaking to you, not all the politicians and everybody else.

The reason Sites Reservoir, and I've been pushing just like Marian for 25 years -- oh, and also, one thing. You heard a earlier statement that CVPIA allotted 800,000 acre-feet to the environment. In that same contract or agreement, it said that the federal government would replace that water with storage, that they would find a means. So that's not a no sum gain, as it was alluded to. That was water that was supposed to be given back to us over time.

But anyway, as it affects us locally, and I talk about Glenn County, Colusa County, and Yolo County, as we well saw in the last couple of weeks, we've closed Highway 162, Maxwell Road, Highway 20, and the Hahn Road, of course, and then Lonestar for two or three days at a shot, and then they come back and forth. But we didn't really get that much rain. And if you -- if nothing else, the flood control aspect of this Sites Reservoir, and some of the other reservoirs that've been proposed along the west side, every time we get a road flooded in this county not only is it inconvenient, it does damage to farm ground, it does damages to the road. And all that relates right back to our -- we have to fix those roads. So we have to pay that in money.

So you've heard tonight that that reservoir will probably be built by southern California, and that, in essence, we couldn't afford the \$600 fee per acre-foot. But, remember that for the people who aren't involved in the water process, they call it an exchange. We use that water, they use our water, and so it's a net gain because they're using river water and we're using Sites water, so everybody's, you know, and they pay for the river water at the \$600 rate and we pay the -- our river water rate for that water, so it works out.

There's one thing that I would like to address the group here tonight. When it comes to the operation of filling the Sites Reservoir, one thing comes to mind, and as a farmer, I'm always thinking of what could go wrong. And I was just sitting there thinking, you know, what if we start a whole bunch of water down to Maxwell here, and then we're going to pump it up into Sites, and the electricity went off. If you think about that, you could really have a big problem down at the end of the Tehama-Colusa Canal.

And so as a proposal, I'd like you to consider possibly moving, or continuing the canal, the Tehama-Colusa Canal on down as it was originally proposed, at least into Yolo County, because there are some areas down there that have some offstream canyon storage that would be great groundwater recharge. And as you well know, Yolo County has subsidence on the west side down there, and they could really utilize. But it would be a buffer, so that if my scenario ever came true, that it had somewhere to go.

And so consider that, and as I'm sitting here I'm thinking of a lot of things that could go wrong, so I'll write some more comments down. But it's possible that even Contra Costa County -- and I'm reaching out of the scope here a little bit, but when I think of the amount of water that northern California has to use to push the salt back in the Delta so that Contra Costa County can take water that's fresh, fresher than saltwater, maybe it'd be more efficient to bring water down the west side to Contra Costa County, and then allow the Delta maybe to come -- become a little more saltier a little further north, as it was back in the fifties and the forties.

And again, I'm just throwing things around here. But we ought to evaluate the efficiency of the whole system. And I know there's a lot of negative feelings about letting the saltwater intrude further into the Delta, but, you know, you only got X amount of water. And so if we're using water right now to push the salt back down into the Bay, maybe it'd be wiser to consider doing something else.

And so, at any rate -- and I encourage all the landowners here who aren't paid professionals or running for office to think about some of those farmer scenarios, problems and what-not, and get specific about them. You know, about this -- like if the electricity goes off, or whatever, and write those things down. Don't just assume, because we hear a lot of talk here

about the integrated planning and management and all this, but nobody's ever talked specifically about some of the things that can happen.

And so write that stuff down, and send it in. We do have an opportunity to go ahead and address the folks who are in charge of this, and -- but a lot of times we have concerns, but they can't relate to those concerns because they don't -- they're not thinking of the same specifics that we're thinking of, when I think of electricity going off.

So with that, I'll sit down.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Mr. Tom Griffin.

MR. GRIFFITH: I'm Tom Griffith. I farm in the west side, south of the project. I didn't intend to speak when I came here, I really didn't have anything to say. But I don't know how many people know the location or where the -- some of the people that spoke earlier actually live. And I just -- I'm very touched by their willingness to sacrifice their homes and their ranches, Mary Wells, the Mathis family, Dick and Marian Mathis and Ken Wells, also, to improve the condition of the State of California. They're very, I think very unselfish in what they're offering to do. And I just hope that the people involved in the project take that into consideration, that these people are giving up properties that have been in their families for generations, and are willing to relocate elsewhere for the benefit of the State of California.

And another aspect that really hasn't been touched upon. Somewhat, the access roads were discussed, but the ranches that are out there are going to be greatly impacted as far as the managing of the livestock and how the -- I do have a ranch out there that I lease, I don't own it, so it's not going to impact me as much as it's going to impact them. But the facilities that we need to handle and process all the livestock and large areas around that valley are going to be impacted, as well. And I hope people consider that. It is -- it's going to take a lot of thought and a lot of changes to make that workable, as far as our ability to get those cattle in and out of that entire area. And people, as well.

So it's going to have a lot of impact, and I really appreciate what these people are willing to do. It's not near as much of a sacrifice for myself as it is for them, but they have a lot of foresight and are very generous in their acceptance of this project.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Okay. At this time we do not have anymore speaker cards. Oh, we do have one more speaker card. Frank Sieferman.

MR. SIEFERMAN: That's good enough.

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Okay.

(Laughter.)

MR. SIEFERMAN: Some people have trouble pronouncing names. I don't have any problem with it. Sieferman is how I pronounce it.

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: I apologize.

MR. SIEFERMAN: No problem. I didn't come prepared to say anything, but I thought I would. My county's not represented here tonight. I'm a little disappointed. I spent time on the Yolo County Board of Supervisors a little less than ten years ago. I was at Mary Wells' ranch one time. I and my neighbor worked very hard a few years ago with the Department of Water Resources, trying

to show them that what they were doing with the CALFED program was not far enough. They needed to look at all the storage on the west side of this valley.

I still farm in Yolo County. I own land on the west side of the freeway. Originally, the Tehama-Colusa Canal was supposed to go through part of my property. The comment by John Garner about extending that canal is still viable. That's another option. Maybe somebody'll look at it at some time.

The comments about how long it takes to build a dam, I didn't hear anybody really pin it down, but you'll never build one within 25 to 30 years if you start today. I'm 75, and unlike some of the rest of the speakers I won't be here long enough to see it. But that's all right. The generations coming beyond are going to need this water. It's high time that we find a place to store it.

It was talked about the Cottonwood Reservoir. No question that reservoir should be looked at. There's an ample supply of water there. Certainly it will have some effect that would be negative to the Sacramento River, but there's still plenty of water in that river. We just have to manage how we send it down to the Delta.

I had previously owned land in the Colusa Basin. My neighbors, one of them's right here, Tom Hermle. Stand up, Tom. His house was built a long time ago. His neighbor's house was built 100 years ago. Never had water in it until '95, and it was four feet off the ground and was still in the house. So we need to have these reservoirs, as Keith Hansell said, to take the floodwaters off of this basin.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

FACILITATOR BUCHHOLZ: Do we have anymore speakers? Okay.

I want to thank you for your participation. I think your turn-out was very impressive, and it shows the willingness to participate in this part of the process. We do have -- do we have another speaker's card? The -- I just want to make sure everybody has an opportunity.

I do want to remind you that we are taking written comments. They can be mailed or faxed in to Scott Woodland. And Scott has his business cards there in the back, and you can pick them up as you leave so that you have the notification address.

Thank you again for attending and participating tonight.

(Thereupon the Scoping Meeting was concluded at 8:00 p.m.)

-oOo-

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, PETER PETTY, an Electronic Reporter, do hereby certify: That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing Department of Water Resources Public Scoping Meeting was reported by me and thereafter transcribed into typewriting. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney

for any of the parties in this matter, nor in any way interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this

28th day of January, 2002.

Peter Petty

Official Reporter